DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 273 FL 016 332

AUTHOR Burtoff, Michele

TITLE Haitian Creole Literacy Evaluation Study. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Haitian Centers Council, Inc., Brooklyn, NY.
PUB DATE 19 Dec 85
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Literacy; Adults; Comparative Analysis; *English (Second Language); *Ethnicity; *Haitian Creole; *Literacy Education; *Native Language Instruction; Outcomes of Education; Second Language Learning; *Self Esteem; Time Factors (Learning); Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

The question whether individuals receiving prior native language (Haitian Creole) literacy instruction develop greater proficiency in the second language (English) than those receiving only second language instruction is explored. Subjects were adult Haitians in the New York City area who were provided with instruction during the course of the study. The report describes the study's structure, the content of the literacy and English courses, and the results obtained. The findings revealed that those who received native language literacy instruction developed comparable English proficiency and greater literacy skills than the English-only group, supporting the provision of native language literacy instruction in addition to second language instruction. The study also found anecdotal evidence that the beneficial outcomes of native language literacy extend beyond second language proficiency to include improved confidence and motivation. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277273

Haitian Creole Literacy Evaluation Study

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to

THE HAITIAN CENTERS COUNCIL, INC.
Brooklyn, New York

Michele Burtoff
Principal Investigator

Center for Applied Linguistics
Washington, D.C.
December 19, 1985

FL016332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G R Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mr. Joseph Etienne, Executive Director of the Haitian Centers Council, for his help and cooperation throughout the course of the study. He gave of his time freely and always offered an understanding ear. I would also like to thank all the Directors of the Haitian community centers that participated in the study. Without their cooperation, the study would not have been possible.

Teachers who participated in the study also deserve acknowledgement for their dedication and caring. They are (in alphabetical order):

Marsophie AGNANT
Faidherbe BOYER
Chantal DEJEAN
Eric DELVA
Ludner ETIENNE
Marie Edith E. JEAN
Eddy MOISE
Carol PHILOGENE

Special thanks to Chantal Dejean for her help; and to Iv Dejan, of the Bank Street College of Education, for everything he has done to get the literacy classes started.

Michele Burtoff,
Principal Investigator
Center for Applied Linguistics
Washington, D.C.

December 19, 1985

Table of Contents

I.	**Introduction**	1
A.	Background	1
B.	Goals of the Study	3
III.	**The Study**	4
A.	Subjects	4
B.	Treatment Groups	5
C.	Data Collection Procedures and Analysis	7
III.	**Instructional Components and Conditions**	9
A.	Course Content and Materials	9
B.	Teachers	10
C.	Attendance	10
IV.	**Results**	12
A.	Statistical Results	12
B.	Non-statistical Results	14
V.	**Conclusion**	16
A.	Implications of the Results	16
B.	Limitations of the Study	16
Appendices		19

I. Introduction

A. Background

Over the past several years the increasing numbers of illiterate adult refugees and immigrants in this country have posed a new problem for English as a Second Language (ESL) professionals and educational institutions alike. How do you teach the needed language and job skills to illiterates, when traditional materials and approaches require a high degree of literacy skills? In partial response to the problem, new ESL teaching materials and curricula have been developed which do not require (advanced) literacy skills. Yet, most ESL teachers still find that their illiterate students have less success in the second language classroom than their literate peers. The answer to this dilemma may reside in the results of literacy research which demonstrate that literacy is more than just the acquisition of a set of mechanical coding and decoding skills, but rather a way of processing information. In other words, the development of literacy results in important long-term cognitive consequences for the individual.

Havelock (1963) argues that the inception of alphabetic writing changed the structure of human thinking and logic. Furthermore, Goody (1968) asserts that the use of a phonetic alphabet is linked to an individual's ability to abstract and to utilize other higher-order cognitive abilities. Based on studies with both literates and illiterates of the Wolof people in Africa, Bruner and Greenfield (1972) conclude that writing promotes cognitive development and suggest that "symbolic technologies" (such as writing) determine abilities.

Scribner and Cole (1977), in research with the Vai people of Northwest Liberia, tried to separate the effects of literacy from those of formal schooling. They found that those who are literate, but have no formal schooling, do better than non-literates in certain cognitively demanding tasks; i.e. they found that literacy increases one's ability to discuss the structure of language, to successfully play board games, and to perform tasks which require the ability to organize, such as memorizing and repeating sentences or word lists. This finding underscores the importance of native-language literacy as a cognitively enriching experience which may facilitate second language mastery.

One of the very few studies to date which has systematically explored the effects of native language literacy on ESL proficiency was

conducted by another staff member at the Center for Applied Linguistics, B. Robson (1981), on a group of Hmong from Laos at the Ban Vinai refugee camp in Thailand. Robson tested the effects of previously acquired Hmong literacy or formal education in Laos on performance in a three-month ESL/cultural orientation program in the refugee camp to determine whether a native language literacy component should be included in the ESL program.

The findings by Scribner and Cole, i.e. that schooling may bring some benefits not specifically attributable to literacy, led Robson to investigate the effects of *both* literacy and education on second language mastery. Thus, she divided her population into four groups:

- no education, non-literate
- no education, literate
- educated, non-literate
- educated, literate

An analysis of the pre- and post-test scores led Robson to conclude that literacy in any language (i.e. Hmong, Lao, or Thai) helped the subjects in their efforts to learn another language. Moreover, subjects who were literate in Hmong had as much advantage in language learning as those with only education. Although this study demonstrated the effects of both literacy and formal schooling, it was limited in that it only measured language performance in the classroom, and also focused on subjects who were learning language in an isolated setting, with only minimal access to natural language input.

In addition to facilitating mastery of a second language, it has been suggested that native-language literacy may also increase cultural awareness as well as enhance cultural identity. Cárdenas and Cárdenas (1972) believe that the lack of compatibility between the home and school language of minority language children results in a poor self-image and poor performance in school; they have proposed native language literacy instruction to remedy the problem. Moreover, in an experiment conducted by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) in Ghana, Bendor-Samuel (1980) found that a program in which adults were taught to read and write in their native language before progressing to English resulted not only in increased literacy but in cultural pride as well.

B. Goals of the Study

Previous research and experience suggest that the potential benefits of native language literacy for second language learning and for learning in general are great. It should be noted that although there exists a good deal of impressionistic or anecdotal support for such an approach, the number of critical, longitudinal, empirical research studies are very few. An exhaustive search of the ERIC, LLBA, Dissertation Abstracts, and Psychological Abstracts data bases revealed only three studies which examined literacy and language proficiency. Moreover, they tended to focus on bilingual children, not adults. Thus, the opportunity to study *adult* Haitian Creole literacy -- to test the effects of native language literacy on ESL proficiency in this country (where access to natural language input during daily activities was also available) -- was an important one.

With diminishing resources for ESL instruction for refugees and immigrants, program implementors have to maximize their resources and decide how to use the time available in their programs most efficiently. That is, they must decide whether or not native language literacy instruction should be provided (in addition to ESL instruction), and if so, how much.

Therefore, the principle research question examined was:

- Do subjects who receive prior native language (Haitian Creole) literacy instruction develop greater proficiency in the second language (English) than those who receive only second language instruction when total instruction time is held constant?

An additional research question of interest was:

- Do subjects who receive native language literacy instruction develop a greater sense of cultural pride and personal identity as a consequence of their becoming literate in their native language?

Due to constraints of time on the part of the subjects, the latter question, unfortunately, could not be formally investigated. (However, see Chapter VI for some anecdotal evidence.)

II The Study

A study was undertaken to investigate the principle research question, i.e.: *Do subjects who receive prior native language (Haitian Creole) literacy instruction develop greater proficiency in the second language (English) than those who receive only second language instruction when total instruction time is held constant?* The study was conducted under the auspices of the Haitian Centers Council of Brooklyn, New York with funding for the Haitian Creole literacy program and the study provided by the Ford Foundation. Data from the study was collected between May 1984 - March 1985 at five Haitian community centers, all member groups of the Haitian Centers Council, who participated in the study. They are:

#1 Haitian Neighborhood Service Center (HNSC)
New York, New York

#2 Charlemagne Péralte Center (CPC)
Brooklyn, New York

#3 Haitian American United for Progress (HAUP)
Cambria Heights, New York

#4 Brooklyn Haitian Ralph and Good Sheperd (BHRAGS)
Brooklyn, New York

#5 Haitian American Cultural and Social Organization (HACSO)
Spring Valley, New York

Henceforth, these centers will be referred to by number and/or acronym. (Appendix A contains a complete listing of the Haitian Centers Council and its member organizations.)

A. Subjects

The subjects for the study were all drawn from the adult Haitian community in the New York metropolitan area. All subjects:

- had little or no education (i.e. no more than 2 years of schooling, with a lot of absenteeism).
- were illiterate (in all languages).
- had no demonstrable control of spoken English.

All potential subjects were interviewed (in Haitian Creole) for background information such as education, individually tested (again in Haitian Creole) for Creole literacy, and tested again, using the Core Section of the Basic English Skills Test (B.E.S.T.) for English. Eligibility for the study in terms of the first two conditions (i.e. lack of education and literacy skills) was determined by Iv Dejan of The Bank Street College on the basis of the interview questionnaire and the Haitian Creole Literacy Test, both of which he devised. Lack of English proficiency was determined by the score on the B.E.S.T.; this became the pre-test score once the subjects were admitted to the study. (See Section C of this chapter for a more detailed description of the testing instrument.)

Although we had originally planned for a minimum of 90 participants in the study (i.e. 30 in each of three treatment groups; see Section B), this was not possible for a number of reasons. First of all, in order to avoid the stigma attached to illiteracy, the program for the study was advertised as an "ESL program" only; since the Haitian community centers had previously provided language classes mostly aimed at literates in the Haitian community, it was this literate population that initially showed up for testing. In addition, not enough lead time was allowed for advertisement of the program, which resulted in advertising that was sporadic and not well-organized. Once word trickled down in the community that the program was specifically for non-literates, the illiterate population was wary; they could not see much reason to learn to read and write Creole, and many were fearful for their legal status. In addition, they lacked the self-confidence to "go to school."

Therefore, although approximately 130 subjects were tested initially, approximately 90 were deemed eligible for the study. Of those 90, only 65 attended class on any kind of regular basis. Many dropped out before even beginning due to the lag time between testing and the start of classes. Moreover, attrition was quite high, as subjects moved, changed jobs and work schedules, and had to deal with health and family problems. Attendance also was poor, resulting in incomplete data. As a result, 29 subjects are described in the final study .

B. Treatment Groups

The subjects were then randomly assigned to one of two major treatment groups. Group One, *Haitian Creole literacy*, received 12 weeks of Haitian Creole literacy instruction (as prescribed by the Haitian Centers

Council program; see Chapter III for a description of the course content), followed by 12 weeks of regular ESL instruction, for a total of 24 weeks of instruction. Classes were held 3 times per week for 2 hours, for a total of 6 hours per week.

Group Two, *ESL only*, received two 12-week cycles of regular ESL instruction, for a total of 24 weeks of instruction. Again, classes were held 3 times per week for 2 hours, for a total of 6 hours per week.

Originally, we had also planned to examine another group, *Haitian Creole literacy + ESL*. This group was to have received 12 weeks of literacy instruction (2 classes per week) as well as 12 weeks of literacy instruction (1 class per week). Following the initial 12 weeks of instruction, they were to receive 12 weeks of regular ESL instruction (as did the two major treatment groups), for a total of 24 weeks of instruction. Unfortunately, the number of subjects did not permit the creation of this group.

In fact, the small numbers did not allow for a "neat" research design either. As mentioned earlier, five member centers of the Haitian Centers Council participated in the study. Ideally, we had hoped that each center would sponsor one class (of approximately 10 students each) for each of the two major treatment groups. In other words, we would have liked to have had a Haitian Creole literacy class and an ESL class at each center. However, an equal number of subjects was not available at each site. For example, at Center #1 (HNSC), 16 eligible subjects were initially available. Thus, they were randomly assigned to one of the two treatment groups. Yet, at Center #2 (CPC), only seven eligible subjects were available. Therefore, for fear of losing them, we decided to start a class with a minimum of seven subjects. We hoped that once class began, word would spread within the Haitian community and more students would show up. (This happened, but not to the extent we had hoped.)

In almost all cases where there were only enough subjects at a given site for one class initially, the class formed was a Haitian Creole literacy class. Since the majority of the illiterate population did not see the value of learning literacy in Haitian Creole, there would have been initial resistance to studying Haitian Creole literacy, especially if there were an existing ESL class. However, by making Haitian Creole literacy the *only* class available, we avoided such resistance; there would have been no resistance by "late arrivals" if they were offered an ESL class (instead of a literacy class). Unfortunately, the second class (i.e. the ESL class) at most of the sites never materialized. We simply lacked the number of eligible

students available to begin class at a given location at a given time. Therefore, only two centers, namely Center #1 (HNSC) and Center #4 (BHRAGS) offered *ESL only* classes, making for a very small treatment group. This caused the study to be a bit "lop-sided" in terms of numbers.

C. Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

Subjects were tested for ESL proficiency at three different times: prior to the beginning of the study (i.e. the pre-test); at 12 weeks; and again at 24 weeks (i.e. the post-test).

The assessment instrument used for this testing was the Core Section of the Basic English Skills Test (B.E.S.T.), developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). The B.E.S.T. was chosen for a number of reasons:

- A number of different forms of the test are available.
- It has proved valid and reliable for measuring proficiency at very low levels as well as at higher levels.
- The test items are coded so that a breakdown of scores in the different skill areas (listening, speaking, reading and writing) is easily accessible.
- The test is constructed in such a way that it is easily administered; students who are unable to answer a number of consecutive questions stop at that point. Thus, the test which must be administered individually, is time-efficient.

The tests were administered by the principal investigator and three employees of the Haitian Centers Council who were trained to do so. Due to difficulty in scheduling, mid-cycle testing was not conducted at all sites; therefore, final analysis was performed only on pre- and post-test scores.

As mentioned in Section B of this chapter, all subjects were pre-tested for Haitian Creole (HC) literacy skills to determine eligibility in the study. However, subjects in the *Haitian Creole literacy* treatment group were also post-tested for HC literacy by Iv Dejan of The Bank Street College of Education, who developed both assessment instruments as well as the HC literacy course. Although the results of these tests were not used in the final analysis of the study (since the aim of the study was to examine the effects of literacy skills on *ESL proficiency*), they were collected by Dr. Dejan for further research into HC literacy.

The pre- and post-test scores of the different forms of the B.E.S.T. were analyzed by using analysis of covariance techniques to control for pre-test score differences. The major independent variables analyzed were time of testing (i.e. pre- and post-) and treatment group membership (i.e. *HC literacy* or *ESL only*). Separate analyses of covariance were performed using component scores as well as total test scores as the dependent variables. The results of the statistical analyses are discussed in Chapter IV.

III. Instructional Components and Conditions

A. Course Content and Materials

Haitian Creole Literacy Course

All subjects in treatment Group One, i.e. students who received 12 weeks of Haitian Creole literacy instruction, received the same 12-week course of instruction, regardless of the center/site at which they studied. All were taught literacy skills in Haitian Creole with the use of the same text, *Aprann Li* by Iv Dejan. The book contains many (labeled) pictures as well as model sentences. Dejan employs a meaning-centered approach to reading which includes the teaching of sightwords as well as phonic decoding strategies; the book contains 30 lessons which are organized in a step-by-step progression.

In addition, teachers were supplied with a 30-page teachers' guide to this text, *Kouman Pou Nou Montre Granmoun Li*, also by Iv Dejan. In fact, all teachers of Haitian Creole literacy, all native Creole speakers, were previously tested by Dejan for their reading and writing abilities in Haitian Creole before being selected as literacy teachers. These teachers then attended three training sessions conducted by Dr. Dejan to learn how to present and teach the materials.

ESL Course

The course content and materials employed in the teaching of ESL, unfortunately, were by no means as consistent or as structured as those used in the 12 weeks of literacy instruction. All subjects (i.e. those in Group One who received ESL instruction during the second 12-week cycle, and those in Group Two who received two 12-week cycles of ESL instruction) followed a slightly different course of study, depending on the center/site at which they studied. No uniform text was used; in fact, the availability of ESL materials varied at the different sites. In addition, ESL teachers, all native speakers of Haitian Creole, had varying abilities in spoken English.

Nevertheless, a uniform, competency-based "survival" ESL curriculum (developed by the Haitian American Training Institute, predecessor of the Haitian Centers Council) was available and designated for use by all teachers. Although a few of the objectives in this curriculum

concerned the teaching of (certain) literacy skills, most of the curricular objectives were aural/oral. Unfortunately, however, not all the ESL instructors followed the designated curriculum, for they had not been trained to do so. Only a few of the ESL teachers, those who had previously taught ESL for the Haitian American Training Institute had been trained to use the curriculum; therefore, they were the only ones who followed it. This lack of control and uniformity in training and use of a designated curriculum and accompanying materials resulted in the subjects receiving different types of ESL instruction, which could possibly affect the outcome of a study of this kind.

B. Teachers

As mentioned in Section A, all the teachers involved in the study were native speakers of Haitian Creole. Except for the Haitian Creole literacy teachers, who had been tested, selected and trained by Iv Dejan, there were no controls used in the selection of ESL teachers. Although a majority of the ESL teachers had previously taught ESL at the community centers, not all of them had received training either in the use of the curriculum or in teaching methods in general.

Furthermore, there were differences in the teachers' educational backgrounds. A few had earned, or were studying for degrees in education, while others did not. In addition, some had come to the United States at a very young age and thus had native speaker control over the language, while others did not. This resulted in a difference in the quality of instruction, which undoubtedly would affect the outcome of a study of this kind.

C. Attendance

Although it was not possible for the principal investigator to obtain complete attendance records, a word about attendance is in order since it is an important component in a 24-week study. Subjects were to attend class for 6 hours each week, for a total of 144 hours of instruction, some of which was spent on testing activities.

Unfortunately, however, absenteeism was quite high. Based on the partial attendance records obtained, all subjects missed at least one class. Most of them missed quite a few classes, so that, on the average, subjects were absent about 30% of the time; many dropped out entirely.

This is not surprising given the responsibilities and uncertainties in the lives of this adult population. Some had employment conflicts; many more had children and other family responsibilities. All the subjects who remained in the program until the end were women; the men dropped out when they found jobs. These women, however, could not always attend since they had family responsibilities and were sometimes fearful to go to class alone at night.

Yet, the highly-motivated persisted in coming to class despite adverse conditions such as classrooms undergoing renovation, poor lighting, little or no heat or air-conditioning, etc. Although the rate of absenteeism affected the outcome of the study in that the total member of subjects who remained in the study was small, those whose scores were used in the final analysis were apparently the most highly-motivated.

IV. Results

A. Statistical Results

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), to adjust for differences in pre-test scores, was performed on the post-test scores of the two treatment groups. In addition, separate ANCOVAs were performed on the component scores of the tests. Given that in Group 1, *Haitian Creole Literacy* (and ESL), N = 21, and that in Group 2, ESL only, N = 8, it is not surprising that the results are statistically non-significant (F = .61; 1,26 *df*, p >.44) on the total test scores. Yet, a closer look at the component scores as well as the total test scores *by center* reveals some interesting patterns.

Table 1

Mean Scores
(Entire Sample)

B.E.S.T. TEST	Group #1 (N = 21) Creole literacy (& ESL)		Group #2 (N = 8) ESL only	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
TOTAL SCORE	19.8	28.5	29.3	40.9
Listening Comprehension	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.8
Communication	11.6	15.0	17.1	23.0
Fluency	2.0	4.1	2.8	7.3
Reading & Writing	2.0	4.5	4.4	5.4

Table 1 is a chart of the total mean scores as well as the mean component scores of both groups. If we examine the scores for communication and fluency, we see that the *ESL only* group gained many more points than the *Creole literacy* group. (Communication and fluency on the B.E.S.T. are both oral skills; communication is the ability to understand and orally respond to a question, while fluency is the ability to give extended oral answers and explanations.) In fact, the results for communication (F = 3.75; 1,26 *df*, p > .10) and fluency (F = 3.71; 1,26 *df*, p > .07) approach statistical significance; unfortunately, it is in favor of the *ESL only* group. Therefore, subjects who received native language

literacy instruction did *not* develop greater second language proficiency than those who received only second language instruction during a comparable period of time. However, this is clearly logical; after all, the *ESL only* group received *twice* as much ESL instruction as the *HC literacy* group. Thus, the *ESL only* group gained more points on tests of oral English.

An examination of the component scores for (English) reading & writing reveals that the *Creole literacy* group gained more points than the *ESL only* group (cf. Table 1). In fact, the results of this test component ($F = 1.62$; 1,26 *df*, $p > .21$) again approach statistical significance, but this time favor the *Creole literacy* group. This appears to suggest that at least some of the Creole literacy skills gained through instruction transferred to English.

Table 2

Mean Scores
(Center #1)

B.E.S.T. TEST	Group #1 (N = 7) Creole literacy (& ESL)		Group #2 (N = 4) ESL only	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
TOTAL SCORE	30.3	42.1	31.5	42.5
Listening Comprehension	4.1	4.5	3.8	4.0
Communication	17.7	22.7	17.8	23.0
Fluency	4.9	8.0	3.3	8.0
Reading & Writing	2.3	5.3	5.3	5.8

The principal investigator feels that it is important to examine the mean scores at Center #1 at this point, for Center #1 can be viewed as a microcosm of the entire study. Center #1 is only one of two centers that

had subjects in both treatment groups; in other words, it offered both a Creole literacy class and an ESL (only) class, which were controlled for site/location. Furthermore, the teachers at Center #1 had both been trained in the use of the designated curriculum, and had had previous teaching experience. Thus, the two groups were also controlled for content and quality of instruction.

An examination of the total mean scores at Center #1 reveals that the *HC literacy* group gained + 11.8 points, while the *ESL only* group gained + 11.0 points; i.e. the *HC literacy* group fared slightly better. Yet in communication the *HC literacy* group and *ESL only* group gained + 5.0 and + 5.2, respectively; in fluency they gained + 3.1 and + 4.7, respectively. However, in reading and writing (literacy skills), the difference in gains was much more pronounced; they gained + 3.0 and + 0.5, respectively. What, then, does all this mean?

Although we cannot say that subjects who received native language literacy instruction (as well as ESL) performed better on the B.E.S.T. than those who received only second language instruction during the same period of time, the mean score results at Center #1 seem to indicate that they develop an almost comparable ESL proficiency as well as greater literacy skills. Therefore, it appears likely that students in an ESL program containing a native language literacy component could attain a comparable level of ESL proficiency *in addition to* better literacy skills when compared to students in a regular ESL program (i.e. without a native language literacy component), during the same period of time.

B. Non-statistical Results

In spite of the fact that the statistical results of the study were non-significant, there was some non-quantifiable evidence which suggests beneficial outcomes of native language literacy instruction that have little to do with greater second language proficiency. Although we were unable to formally investigate whether or not those who receive native language literacy instruction develop a greater sense of cultural pride and personal identity as a consequence of their becoming literate, the principal investigator attempted to collect some indirect, relevant evidence. At the end of the 24 week period, a semi-structured questionnaire was sent to all of the teachers; unfortunately, most of the questionnaires were never returned. However, informal conversations with some of the teachers during the course of the 24 weeks offered the principal investigator some

anecdotal evidence which seems to indicate an increase in self-conficence and pride.

One teacher reported that a student, who had never before in her life written a letter, was inspired by the literacy instruction she was receiving to write a letter to a friend in Haiti. She brought the letter to class for the teacher to look over before mailing; the teacher reported that the letter contained numerous errors, but it was communicative. The student seemed quite proud of her accomplishment; she now had the power to communicate in writing all by herself!

Another anecdote reported by the same teacher concerns a student who had been getting a change of address card from her bank in the mail regularly for many years. (It seems that she had moved long ago.) After having attended the literacy class for a short while, she seemed to understand what that piece of correspondence was. She promptly filled it out and brought it to class for the teacher to check before she mailed it. Again, the student was proud, realizing that literacy was a passport to independence in society.

A number of the literacy teachers reported that literacy instruction had greatly motivated their students. Although there had been some initial resistance to Creole literacy instruction, it soon disappeared. In fact, a number of students who lived or worked a distance from where classes were held persistently came to class, even if they were going to be late.

Further evidence of a change in attitude was reported at Center #1, which offered classes for both treatment groups. Many of the students in the ESL only group were initially quite happy about not having to study Creole. However, as the first 12-week cycle ended, word had trickled down that those in the Creole literacy class were learning how to read and write. A number of students in the ESL only class then approached the literacy teacher; they wanted to transfer into her class because they wanted to learn how to read and write, too!

Thus, it appears that native language literacy instruction provides benefits other than second language proficiency. Over the 24-week period, subjects belonging to the *Haitian Creole literacy* group had developed not only greater second language proficiency (than when they began), but greater literacy skills as well as more self-confidence. In the same period, subjects in the *ESL only* group had developed only greater second language proficiency.

V. Conclusion

A. Implications of the Results

To summarize Chapter IV, the results of the study were statistically non-significant; thus, in this study, there is no empirical evidence to support the notion that subjects who receive native language literacy instruction (e.g., Haitian Creole) develop greater proficiency in a second language (e.g., English) than those who receive only second language instruction for comparable periods of time. However, this does *not* suggest that native language literacy instruction is not worthwhile, for it certainly has its benefits.

From the data collected, mean component scores revealed that subjects in the *HC literacy* group gained more points in (English) literacy skills than those in the *ESL only* group; this suggests that literacy skills *do* transfer, at least between languages that both employ a roman alphabet. Furthermore, anecdotal evidence supports the notion that subjects who receive native language literacy instruction may also develop greater self-confidence as a result of their literacy. Yet, it is most important to note that the data seems to suggest that subjects in the *HC literacy* group gained almost as much in terms of second language proficiency as those in the *ESL only* group. Yet, those in the latter group had received *twice* as much ESL instruction as those in the former group. This leads the principal investigator to believe that if both groups had been given twice as much instruction (i.e. 48 weeks), results would probably have been quite different. In other words, it is possible that the beneficial effects of native language literacy instruction on second language proficiency cannot be seen (statistically) in only 24 weeks. Therefore, it is strongly suggested that the time period be extended in any kind of replication study.

B. Limitations of the Study

The study does not offer any conclusive, statistical evidence to empirically support the potential benefits of native language literacy for second language learning. Yet, it does suggest the need for further investigation. As suggested in Section A, perhaps a more comprehensive longitudinal study, which may show greater and statistically significant gains by the native language literacy students, is in order. Before another similar type of study is undertaken, however, investigators should take

care to avoid some of the pitfalls which affected both the final outcome and efficiency of this study.

First of all, sufficient time for planning and recruitment should be allowed. Since the subjects in the study are adults, a "non-captive" audience with many economic and family pressures, there is bound to be a high rate of attrition. Therefore, initial recruitment efforts must be able to draw a large number of potential subjects to allow for attrition, and not statistically affect the final numbers. Moreover, classes must be in place as soon as subjects become available; if there is too much lag time between initial testing and the beginning of class, many potential students are lost.

In addition, a longitudinal study of this kind requires a full-time coordinator, especially if classes are held at different sites. While the principal investigator would collect test data, the coordinator would arrange for the periodic testing, keep track of attendance, be responsible for supplying the teachers with appropriate materials, and generally respond to the teachers' problems and needs. The coordinator would allow the principal investigator to retain objectivity throughout the study.

Finally, and probably most important of all, a study of this kind demands that there be specific, set curricula and/or course materials, and that training in their use be provided. Although every teacher has a different style of teaching, there must be some control in the course content and the approaches with which it is delivered. It is impossible to test the effects of instruction if the instruction is not the same.

If these conditions are met, a study such as this one could potentially have very significant results.

REFERENCES

Bendor-Samuel, Margaret. 1980. Mother-tongue literacy programmes in Ghana. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* 1: 321-329.

Bruner, Jerome S. 1973. From communication to language: a psychological perspective. *Cognition.* pp. 255-287.

Cárdenas, Blandina and José A. Cárdenas. 1973. Chicano--bright-eyes, bilingual, brown, and beautiful. *Today's Education.* 41: 49-51.

Center for Applied Linguistics. 1981-1984. *Basic English Skills Test (B.E.S.T.).* Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Dejan, Iv. 1983. *Aprann li.* Chevy Chase, Maryland: Center for Human Services.

Dejan, Iv. 1983. *Kouman pou nou montre granmoun li.* Chevy Chase, Maryland: Center for Human Services.

Goody, Jack (Ed.) 1968. *Literacy in traditional societies.* Cambridge University Press.

Greenfield, P.M. 1972. Oral or written language: the consequences for cognitive development in Africa, the United States and England. *Language and Speech.* 15: 199-277.

Havelock, Eric A. 1963. *Preface to Plato.* Cambidge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Robson, Barbara. 1981. Alternatives in ESL and literacy: Ban Vinai. Asia Foundation Final Report. May.

Robson, Barbara. 1982. Hmong literacy, formal education, and their effects on performance in an ESL class. In *The Hmong in the West.* B.T. Downing and D.P. Olney (eds.) University of Minnesota Press.

Scribner, Sylvia and Michael Cole. 1977. Unpacking literacy. To appear in *Writing*, Volume II. Baltimore.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: MEMBERS OF THE HAITIAN CENTERS COUNCIL

Haitian Centers Council, Inc.
Executive Director: Joseph Etienne
50 Court Street, Suite 605
Brooklyn, New York 11201
Telephone: (718) 855-7275

Haitian Neighborhood Service Center (HNSC)
Director: Jean Dupuy
2465 Broadway (3rd Floor)
New York, New York 10025
Telephone: (212) 595-4040

Charlemagne Péralte Center (CPC)
Director: Marie Edithe E. Jean
333 Lincoln Place
Brooklyn, New York 11238
Telephone: (718) 638-7000

Haitian American United for Progress (HAUP)
Director: Paul Dorsinville
221-05 Linden Blvd.
Cambria Heights, New York 11411
Telephone: (212) 527-3776

Brooklyn Haitian Ralph and Good Sheperd, Inc. (BHRAGS)
Director: Roland Dolcé
899 Winthrop Street
Brooklyn, New York 11203
Telephone: (718) 773-1171

Haitian American Cultural and Social Organization (HACSO)
Director: Dameus Denis
P.O. Box 380
Spring Valley, New York 10977
Telephone: (914) 352-8096

Evangelical Crusade of Fishers of Men
Director: Rev. Philius Nicolas
1488 New York Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11210
Telephone: (718) 434-7250

APPENDIX B: CREOLE BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. All questions must be asked orally and only in Creole by a native speaker of Haitian Creole who will write down the answers.
2. If question 3 is not clearly understood, it should be expanded as: Nan ki zòn, nan ki vil ou byen pi pre ki vil ou fèt? The idea is to avoid that most people inaccurately answer "Port-au-Prince", "Cap" or "Cayes".
3. If the answer to question 8 is "yes" and is confirmed by the answer to question 9 and if the answer to question 10 is "2 years", the candidate CANNOT BE ACCEPTED into the pilot or control classes and should not be asked to take the pretest.
4. If the answer to question 8 is "yes" and is confirmed by the answer to question 9 and if the answer to question 10 is "kèk mwa" or "1 yr." and the answer to question 5 is "no" and to question 6 is "kèk mwa - 2 an", the candidate CAN BE CONSIDERED for the pilot or control classes and should be allowed to take the pretest. In this case the English pretest will help with the final decision.
5. If the answer to question 20 is "yes", to question 21 is "yes", and to question 6 is "more than 3 years" and is confirmed by the answer to question 7, the candidate CANNOT BE ACCEPTED into the pilot or control classes and should not be asked to take the pretest.

April 25, 1984

Yves Dejean

KESYON POU MOUN KI VIN ENSKRI NAN KOU A
Questionnaire for Literacy/ESL candidates

1. Ki non w? _____ (first name) 2. Ki siyati w? _____ (last name)

3. Nan ki komin ou fèt? _____
Birthplace

4. Ki laj ou? _____
Age

5. Èske ou te lekòl ann Ayiti? ___wi (yes) ___ non (no)
Did you go to school in Haiti?

6. Konbyen tan ou pase lekòl? ___ kek mwa, (months) ___ 1 an, (1 yr.) ___ 2 an, (2 yrs.) ___ 3 an, (3 yrs.) ___ plis pase 3 an (more than 3 yrs.)
School years

7. Ki pi gwo klas ou fè? _____
Highest grade reached

8. Èske ou deja suiv kou angle? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no)
Did you ever take an ESL course?

Si se wi
If yes

9. Ki kote ou deja suiv kou angle? _____
Where did you take this ESL course?

10. Pandan konbyen tan ou suiv kou angle? ___ kèk mwa, (months) ___ 1 an, (1 yr.) ___ 2 an, (2 yrs.) ___ 3 an (3 yrs.)
How long did you study English?

11. Èske manman w konn siyen non l? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konen (I don't know)
Can your mother sign her name?

12. Èske manman w te lekòl? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ w pa konnen (I don't know)
Did your mother go to school?

13. Èske manman w kapab li yon lèt? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konnen (I don't know)
Can your mother read a letter?

14. Èske manman w kapab ekri yon lèt? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konnen (I don't know)
Can your mother write a letter?

15. Èske papa w konn siyen non l? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konnen (I don't know)
Can your father sign his name?

16. Èske papa w te lekòl? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konnen (I don't know)
Did your father go to school?

17. Èske papa w kapab li yon lèt? ___ wi (yes) ___ non (no) ___ m pa konnen (I don't know)
Can your father read a letter?

18. Èske papa w kapab ekri yon lèt? ___ wi ___ non ___ m pa konnen
Can your father write a letter? yes no I don't know

19. Èske ou konn siyen non w? ___ wi ___ non
Can you sign your name? yes no

20. Èske ou kapab li yon lèt? ___ wi ___ non
Can you read a letter? yes no

21. Èske ou kapab ekri yon lèt? ___ wi ___ non
Can you write a letter? yes no

22. Èske gen moun ki te montre w silabè? ___ wi ___ non ___ m pa konnen
Were you taught with a spelling book? yes no I don't know

23. Èske w ap travay kounye a? ___ wi ___ non
Are you working now? yes no
What do you do? _____

24. Depi konbyen tan w ap travay isit? ___ semenn, ___ mwa, ___ an
How long have you been working here? weeks months years

25. Ki travay ou te konn fè ann Ayiti? _____
What kind of job did you have in Haiti?

APPENDIX C: CREOLE LITERACY TEST (by IV Dejan)

Non moun nan se: _____ Li syen: _____

Jodi a se _____

PREMYE EGZAMEN POU MOUN KI DI YO PA KONN LI YO

PREMYE PATI

(Montre moun nan alfabè franse a)

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1. Non ki let ou konnen?

(Fè yon wonn alantou lèt moun nan PA KONNEN yo, epi konte konbyen sa fè ____)

2. Èske ou rekonèt lèt sa yo?

d l z b e w r f v g y i m p s j t k o n

(Fè yon wonn alantou lèt miniskil moun nan PA REKONÈT yo, epi konte konbyen sa fè _____)

3. Èske ou rekonèt lèt sa yo?

N O K T J S P M I Y G V F R W E B Z L D

(Fè yon wonn alantou lèt majiskil moun nan PA REKONÈT yo, epi konte konbyen sa fè _____)

DEZYÈM PATI (Bay chak moun yon fèy papye ak yon kreyon byen file epi di yo:)

4. Ekri non wou.

5. Ekri nimewo 1.

6. Ekri nimewo 2.

7. Ekri depi nimewo 3 jis nimewo 10.

8. Ekri depi nimewo 11 jis nimewo 20.

TWAZYEM PATI

9. Li tout mo ou kapab li yo:

papa	do	gaga	mi	sou
ri	ta	si	va	yo
bal	chou	kaki	Japon	ni
manman	pan	ban	sa	mal
vis	fil	joli	mou	chi
la	mari	joupa	kola	tonton

(Fè yon wonn alantou mo moun nan KAPAB li yo, epi konte konbyen sa fè ____)

Non moun nan se: _____ Li siyen: _____

9.

papa	do	gaga	mi	sou
ri	ta	si	va	yo
bal	chou	kaki	Japon	ni
manman	pan	ban	sa	mal
vis	fil	joli	mou	chi
la	mari	joupa	kola	tonton

10.

Papa Rita la.

Papa Rita chita sou ban an.

Rita ba papa li kola a.

Mal la sou ban an.

Si ou ta ba Mari moumou sa a, li ta ri.

10. Li ti koze sa yo:

1. Papa Rita la.

2. Papa Rita chita sou ban an.

3. Rita ba papa li kola a.

4. Mal la sou ban an.

5. Si ou ta ba Mari moumou sa a, li ta ri.

KATRIYEM PATI

11. Ekri ti koze sa yo:

1. Papa Rita la.

2. Papa Toto chita.

3. Toto bo Rita.